

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/808,669	03/25/2004	Howard Scalzo	ETH1690CIP2	6201		
27777	7590 05/31/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
PHILIP S. JOHNSON			EREZO, DARWIN P			
JOHNSON & ONE JOHNSO	JOHNSON ON & JOHNSON PLAZA	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			3731			
			DATE MAILED: 05/31/2003	5		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					DP		
Office Action Summary		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/808,66	9	SCALZO ET AL.			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Darwin P.		3731			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic r Reply	ation appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE N - Exten after 5 - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC is ions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for r	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no evenication. days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the appli	nt, however, may a reply be tin tory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communicat D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ion.		
Status							
1)[X]	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 25 March 2004					
-	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
′=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restricti	withdrawn from cor					
Applicati	on Papers						
9) 🗌 -	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.					
10) 🗌 .	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepted or b)[	objected to by the	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objecti			, ,			
11) 🗆 .	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including to The oath or declaration is objected to l	•	- · ·				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority d.  2. Certified copies of the priority d.  3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International see the attached detailed Office action	ocuments have beer ocuments have beer the priority docume al Bureau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicati nts have been receive e 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment	((s)						
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT		Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate			
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or P r No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/6/04</u> .	TO/SB/08)	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,468,252 to Kaplan et al. in view of US 5,997,815 to Anders et al. in view of US 5,985,934 to Gaffney, and in further view of US 3,896,812 to Kurtz.

Kaplan teaches a suture assembly comprising a containment compartment 10 and a suture 34 positioned within the containment compartment, the suture comprising one or more surfaces having an antimicrobial agent disposed thereon (col. 17, lines 29-43); wherein a plastic cover sheet 20 and base 12 is positioned over the compartment to form an outer package.

Kaplan is silent with regards to the compartment having an antimicrobial agent and the suture having an antimicrobial agent selected from the group consisting of halogenated hydroxyl ethers, acyloxydiphenyl ethers; and further comprising an active agent, such as a biocide.

Anders teaches that it is well known in the art to provide antimicrobial coating to both surgical suture materials and packaging articles (col. 3, lines 1-11). However,

Anders is silent with regards to the antimicrobial agent selected from the group consisting of halogenated hydroxyl ethers, acyloxydiphenyl ethers.

Gaffney teaches an antimicrobial composition comprising 2,4,4'-trichloro-2'-hydroxydiphenyl ether, or triclosan.

Kurtz teaches a suture having biocidal properties.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide antimicrobial properties to the containment compartment of Kaplan, as taught by Anders, because it prevents microbial growth in the suture package during storage. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any well known antimicrobial agent, including the agent taught by Gaffney, because using a particular antimicrobial agent would be a mere design choice since any antimicrobial agent would provide the same function of preventing microbial growth. Moreover, it would have been obvious to use the suture of Kurtz in the device of Kaplan because it prevents bacterial growth on the surgical site.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Darwin P. Erezo whose telephone number is (571) 272-4695. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan T. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-4963. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/808,669 Page 4

Art Unit: 3731

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

de